2003-2004 No Child Left Behind—Blue Ribbon Schools Program Cover Sheet

Name of Principal _	Dr. Judy R. Warrington		
	(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)	(As it should appear in the official	records)
Official School Nam	ne <u>Lulu M. Ross Elementary</u>	School	
	(As it should appear in the	official records)	
School Mailing Add	ress 310 Lovers Lane		
	(If address is P.O. Box, also	include street address)	
Milford		Delaware	19963-2699
City		State	Zip Code+4 (9 digits total)
Tel. (302) 422-1640	Fax	(302) 424-5453	
Website/URL	http://www.k12.de.us/luluross/	index.htm_E-mail_jwarri	ng@mail.milford.k12.de.us
	information in this application, st of my knowledge all informati		equirements on page 2, and
		Date	
(Principal's Signature)			
Name of Superinten	dent□ <u>Dr. Robert D. Smit</u>	th .	
	(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., I	Or., Mr., Other)	
District Name M	ilford School District	Tel. (302)-42	2-1600
	information in this application, st of my knowledge it is accurate		equirements on page 2, and
		Date	
(Superintendent's Sign	nature)		
Name of School Boa President/Chairperso			
	e information in this package, in st of my knowledge it is accurate		quirements on page 2, and
		Date	
(School Board Preside	nt's/Chairperson's Signature)		

PART I - ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

The signatures on the first page of this application certify that each of the statements below concerning the school's eligibility and compliance with U.S. Department of Education, Office of Civil Rights (OCR) requirements is true and correct.

- 1. The school has some configuration that includes grades K-12. (Schools with one principal, even K-12 schools, must apply as an entire school.)
- 2. The school has not been in school improvement status or been identified by the state as "persistently dangerous" within the last two years. To meet final eligibility, the school must meet the state's adequate yearly progress requirement in the 2003-2004 school year.
- 3. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, it has foreign language as a part of its core curriculum.
- 4. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 1998.
- 5. The nominated school or district is not refusing the OCR access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.
- 6. The OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if the OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.
- 7. The U.S. Department of Justice does not have a pending suit alleging that the nominated school, or the school district as a whole, has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes or the Constitution's equal protection clause.
- 8. There are no findings of violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in a U.S. Department of Education monitoring report that apply to the school or school district in question; or if there are such findings, the state or district has corrected, or agreed to correct, the findings.

PART II - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

All data are the most recent year available.

DISTRICT (Questions 1-2 not applicable to private schools)

1.	Number of schools in the district:	3 1 1 	Elementary schools Middle schools Junior high schools High schools Other (Briefly explain) TOTAL
2.	District Per Pupil Expenditure:	\$8,	<u>204</u>
	Average State Per Pupil Expenditure:	<u>\$9,</u>	<u>155</u>
SCl	HOOL (To be completed by all schools		
3.	Category that best describes the area w	where th	ne school is located:
	 Urban or large central city Suburban school with character Suburban Small city or town in a rural a Rural 		typical of an urban area
4.	4 1/2 Number of years the principa	l has be	een in her/his position at this school.
	If fewer than three years, how	v long v	was the previous principal at this school?

5. Number of students enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school:

Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total	-	Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total
K					7			
Pre-2	10	6	16		8			
2	68	70	138		9			
3	81	83	164		10			
4	60	72	132		11			
5	68	87	155		12			
6					Other			
TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL ->								605

	Racial/ethnic composition of the students in the school: Columbia	
7.	Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past year:10%	
	(This rate includes the total number of students who transferred to or from different school October 1 and the end of the school year, divided by the total number of students in the students 1, multiplied by 100.)	
(1	Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	36
(2		29
(3	•	65
(4		621
(5	,	10
(6		10%
	Number of languages represented: 2	n Proficient
9.	Number of languages represented: 3 Specify languages: Spanish; French Creole; Arabic Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 44 %	n Proficient
9.	Number of languages represented: 3 Specify languages: Spanish; French Creole; Arabic	
9.	Number of languages represented: 3 Specify languages: Spanish; French Creole; Arabic Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 44 %	lify ents from orogram,
	Number of languages represented: 3 Specify languages: Spanish; French Creole; Arabic Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 44 % 264 Total Number Students Who Qua If this method does not produce a reasonably accurate estimate of the percentage of stud- low-income families or the school does not participate in the federally-supported lunch produce a more accurate estimate, tell why the school chose it, and explain how it arrived estimate. Students receiving special education services: 14 % 83 Total Number of Students Services:	lify ents from program, at this
	Number of languages represented: 3 Specify languages: Spanish; French Creole; Arabic Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 44 % 264 Total Number Students Who Qua If this method does not produce a reasonably accurate estimate of the percentage of stud- low-income families or the school does not participate in the federally-supported lunch produce a more accurate estimate, tell why the school chose it, and explain how it arrived estimate. Students receiving special education services: 14 %	lify ents from program, at this
	Number of languages represented:3 Specify languages: Spanish; French Creole; Arabic Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals:44 %	lify ents from program, at this
	Number of languages: Spanish; French Creole; Arabic Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals:44 % 264 Total Number Students Who Qua If this method does not produce a reasonably accurate estimate of the percentage of studelow-income families or the school does not participate in the federally-supported lunch produce a more accurate estimate, tell why the school chose it, and explain how it arrived estimate. Students receiving special education services:14 % 83 Total Number of Students Serve Indicate below the number of students with disabilities according to conditions designated Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 1_ Autism8 Orthopedic Impairment Other Health Impaired	lify ents from program, at this
	Number of languages: Spanish; French Creole; Arabic Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals:44 % 264 Total Number Students Who Qua If this method does not produce a reasonably accurate estimate of the percentage of studelow-income families or the school does not participate in the federally-supported lunch produce a more accurate estimate, tell why the school chose it, and explain how it arrived estimate. Students receiving special education services:14 % 83 Total Number of Students Serve Indicate below the number of students with disabilities according to conditions designate Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 1_ Autism8 Orthopedic Impairment Other Health Impaired	lify ents from program, at this
	Number of languages: Spanish; French Creole; Arabic Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals:44 % 264 Total Number Students Who Qual If this method does not produce a reasonably accurate estimate of the percentage of stude low-income families or the school does not participate in the federally-supported lunch processing a more accurate estimate, tell why the school chose it, and explain how it arrived estimate. Students receiving special education services:14 % 83 Total Number of Students Services according to conditions designated Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 1 Autism 8 Orthopedic Impairment Other Health Impaired	lify ents from program, at this

11. Indicate number of full-time and part-time staff members in each of the categories below:

Number of Staff

	Full-time	Part-Time
Administrator(s) Classroom teachers	<u>2</u> <u>37</u>	0
Special resource teachers/specialists	8	6
Paraprofessionals Support staff	9 12	3
Total number	68	9

- 12. Average school student-"classroom teacher" ratio: 16:1
- 13. Show the attendance patterns of teachers and students as a percentage. The student dropout rate is defined by the state. The student drop-off rate is the difference between the number of entering students and the number of exiting students from the same cohort. (From the same cohort, subtract the number of exiting students from the number of entering students; divide that number by the number of entering students; multiply by 100 to get the percentage drop-off rate.) Briefly explain in 100 words or fewer any major discrepancy between the dropout rate and the drop-off rate. (Only middle and high schools need to supply dropout rates and only high schools need to supply drop-off rates.)

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Daily student attendance	94.5	95.6	96.5	95.7	95.3
Daily teacher attendance	96.2	97	96.7	96.8	95.6
Teacher turnover rate	12%	14%	7%	17%	5%
Student dropout rate	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Student drop-off rate	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

PART III - SUMMARY

Provide a brief, coherent narrative snapshot of the school in one page (approximately 475 words). Include at least a summary of the school's mission or vision in the statement.

Lulu M. Ross Elementary School is located in the small rural town of Milford, Delaware. It is one of five schools in the Milford School District. Our school has a population of 605 students in grades 2 through 5 with one pre-second grade class. The racial composition of our student body includes 22% African-American, 1% Asian, 64% Caucasian, and 13% Hispanic. The percentage of students who qualify for the free/reduced lunch program is currently 44%. Our school qualifies as a School-wide Title I program. We have 37 full-time teachers, 14 specialists, 12 paraprofessionals, one nurse, and 14 support staff members at Ross School. Ross School is a Professional Development School in a partnership with the University of Delaware. The downstate Elementary Teacher Education Program for the University of Delaware is located on the campus of Ross School. Our school uses the Baldrige school improvement processes and quality tools to focus on reaching our goals. In the fall of 2002, Ross School was named a "Model of Excellence" by Delaware Lt. Gov. John Carney. During the summer of 2003, Ross School was named a "Superior" school under the new "No Child Left Behind" rating system.

The mission of Ross School is for all students, staff, and families to work together to continually improve academic performance and citizenship. Our school's vision is to educate all students to become responsible members of the global community through continuous social and academic growth. We are committed to helping all students reach their maximum potential. Our school's goals include the following: (1) By the end of each school year, all students will be at or above grade level in Reading and/or increase one grade level; (2) All students will meet or exceed grade level standards in math by attaining a 3 or above (on rubric scored performances and the DSTP); (3) By the end of each school year, all students will consistently meet or exceed the standards in Writing by scoring a 3 or 4 on the 6 Traits Writing Rubric; (4) Our goal is to increase the participation of parents or other significant adults in school-related activities; and, (5) In the area of discipline, our goal is to decrease discipline offenses by 10%.

At Ross School, we work hard to meet the needs of the whole child. In addition to our focus on academics, we have a full-time guidance counselor, a Behavior Specialist, and a Family Crisis Therapist who provide extra support for the students. We also provide Expressive Arts classes in the following areas: physical education, music, technology, affective education, and art.

The Ross School library media center is the hub of our school. We have an open library schedule which enables students, staff, and parents to have consistent access to our library's book collections and other resources. Our school is the recipient of an "Enhancing Education through Technology" grant that is being used to infuse the use of technology throughout our school. Through the grant, a full-time Instructional Technology Specialist, a full-time Writing Specialist, and a library assistant have been added to the Ross School staff.

PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

Reading and Math Assessments

The Delaware Student Testing Program (DSTP) provides both criterion referenced and nationally normed information on student achievement. Over the last five years, Ross 3rd grade students have made steady progress in reading and mathematics as measured by the Delaware Student Testing Program (DSTP). The school year, 2002-2003, was the first year for 5th graders to attend Ross, which provides only a single snapshot of academic performance in that grade; however, the 3rd grade assessments provide a complete data set for analysis and a five-year comparison of progress of relative successive 3rd graders at Ross and with other students in the state of Delaware. DSTP testing at the 3rd grade represents a culmination of student performance on the Delaware K-3 competency clusters.

The DSTP is based on the Delaware content standards and provides an outcome measure of student performance in curricular areas. In reading, the DSTP assesses many aspects of reading using literature, informational readings, and technical documents. Students are asked to read passages and then demonstrate their ability to analyze and interpret what they have read by answering multiple choice questions, short answer questions, and extended response questions. Over the 5 year period, 1999-2003, Ross 3rd graders have steadily advanced from a total of 69.3% meeting or exceeding the reading standards in 1999 to a total of 85.2% in 2003. The progress was matched in all subgroups as evidenced by the disaggregated reading data. In addition, the progress of Ross students relative to other 3rd graders throughout the state also shows them making significant gains in reading as the differential in Ross student performance compared to the total state population moved from being equal in 1999 (69.3% vs. 68.6%) to a level of 85.2% vs. 67.4% in 2003. Nationally normed data also reflect these improved achievement levels for Ross 3rd graders. On the Stanford Achievement Test (SAT-9) the reading comprehension scores rose from an NCE of 54.3 in 1999 to 62.2 in 2003. While the results from the 5th grade testing do not permit longitudinal comparisons for growth, the mean scaled score for reading comprehension (490.2) exceeds the state mean (479.9).

The mathematics section of the DSTP reflects that success in mathematics depends on a student's ability to grasp key concepts and solve realistic problems. Ross 3rd graders duplicated their success in reading in their scores on the DSTP mathematics assessment. The data across the period, 1999-2003, show significant and continuous progress. In 1999, 69.3% of all Ross 3rd graders met or exceeded the mathematics standards. By 2003, 89.0% met or exceeded the standards. Again, these gains were replicated in all subgroups in the disaggregated data relative to their 1999 starting levels. Ross 3rd graders began the comparative period somewhat above other students in the state (69.3% vs. 63.8), but widened this gap to 89.0% vs. 73.6% by 2003. As in reading comprehension, Ross 3rd grade students also made steady progress in math problem solving performance on the SAT-9 test evidenced by their NCE scores rising from 57.3 in 1999 to 69.8 in 2003. The 5th grade mean score for math problem solving (472.9) also exceeded the state mean scaled score (468.4).

One of the major goals of the school has been to reduce the gap between the achievements of subpopulations while increasing the achievement of the total student population. On the DSTP reading assessment in 1999, 46% fewer African American students than Caucasian students met the reading standard at grade 3. In 2000, the gap was decreased to 40%, followed by decreases in the gap to 28% in 2001, 31% in 2002 and 3% in 2003. On the DSTP mathematics assessment, the gap fell from 46% in 1999 to 25% in 2000, 28% in 2001, 8% in 2002, and 10% in 2003. The gap for 5th graders in their first year at Ross was 13.9% for reading and 30.9% for math. Both these differences, especially in math are currently being addressed.

The data for student achievement in reading and mathematics as measured by the DSTP shows a consistent "rising tide" pattern of student performance and academic achievement, which is truly lifting "all boats".

Using Data to Improve Performance

At Ross School, the teachers use a variety of assessment data to make informed decisions about instruction. The data include the information from district assessments, STAR reading and math tests, reading series benchmark tests, and anecdotal notes. The Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA) model is used to plan for instruction and interventions, implement the instruction, study the results, and then act on the results by either

continuing the intervention or modifying it to meet the needs of the students. This model is evidenced through the use of rubrics. It is easy to identify the traits of writing that need additional focus during instruction for particular students. Students are also taught how to self-assess their own writing and this empowers them to become more proficient writers. This method of assessment and instruction is used in all classrooms, thus allowing students to build on their knowledge as they move through each grade. In the area of reading, each question on the end of unit benchmark tests is coded for the specific skill or strategy tested. If a student performs poorly, a teacher knows exactly what needs to be re-taught. Similar tests are available to recheck the students' understanding after the additional instruction. Finally, the math rubric aligned with the Trailblazers curriculum informs a teacher of how well a student is doing with regard to communication, computation, and problem solving in the area of math. If a child is struggling in a specific area, the teacher adjusts instruction to support understanding. Since the Trailblazer curriculum revisits all skills within a grade level and across grade levels, the assessments impact the school's performance as a whole.

Communication related to Student Performance

At Ross School, a variety of methods of communication are used to inform the students, parents, and community about student performance. Students receive ongoing feedback about their performance. Through the use of the Accelerated Reader and Accelerated Math programs, students receive immediate individualized written feedback about their performance on assessments given on their specific level. In addition, the students are provided specific feedback related to their daily work from their teacher. Students are also taught to self-assess their work through the use of rubrics in writing and math. Ross students use data notebooks to track their own performance toward meeting individual learning goals. Information about student performance is shared with parents through a variety of methods, including parent conferences, phone calls, individualized Accelerated Reader and Math reports, mid-marking period reports, and report cards. In addition, each student has an agenda book that serves as a communication log between his/her parent and teacher. Information regarding the student's performance on the DSTP (Delaware State Testing Program) is communicated through individualized reports provided by the state. Ross School shares our school-wide performance data on a large data wall in our lobby. The charts display summary information for reading, math, and writing for the past five years and include data related to our progress in decreasing the achievement gap between non-minority and minority students. These charts are highly visible for all visitors from the community to see. In addition, during our strategic planning sessions each year, we share our student achievement data charts with a large group of 40-50 people (including parents and representatives of the community). This data is used to inform our decision-making related to the development of our School Improvement Plan for the upcoming year. The state also publishes a School Profile that is sent to all parents.

Sharing Our Successes with Other Schools

The faculty and staff are always willing to share our successes with other schools. In the past, when we were one of six Delaware schools to be named a "Model of Excellence", representatives of our staff made a presentation at a state-wide Forum and several schools sent representative teams to visit our school. In addition, Ross School's principal joined the principal of our sister elementary school in making a presentation related to our use of Baldrige processes at a state conference related to school improvement. We work closely with the neighboring elementary school in our district and continuously are involved in sharing and networking. At the state level, our specialists, teachers, and administrators are involved in collaboration and networking related to school improvement. The faculty and staff of Ross School welcome opportunities to share our successes while also focusing on continuous improvement. Our school web site also serves as a means for Ross to present information about our programs, display student work, and share curriculum materials and successful instructional procedures. Through our partnership with the University of Delaware and its downstate Elementary Education program on our campus, our successes can be shared.

PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

The Delaware state standards and performance indicators provide the focus for our instruction at Ross School. A variety of curricula are used to help our students meet the standards. In the area of reading, the Scott Foresman Reading Series is used to teach both phonics skills and comprehension strategies. Trade books are also used as part of reading instruction, and the Accelerated Reader program is used for fluency practice and independent reading on the student's own level. The Four Blocks framework for implementing reading instruction is being piloted in a number of classrooms at Ross. Our full-time Reading Specialist provides model reading lessons on a rotating basis in all classes and provides small group instruction to students who need additional assistance. Our writing instruction at Ross School is based on 6 + 1 Writing Traits. Our full-time Writing Specialist models writing instruction in all classes on a rotating basis. Students are taught to use the Six Traits writing rubric to self-assess their own writing. Writing is integrated into all subject areas.

The Math Trailblazers mathematics program is implemented in all grades. The Trailblazers program is a research-based program that integrates math, science, and language arts. The program was developed by the TIMS (Teaching Integrated Mathematics and Science) Project at the University of Illinois at Chicago. The Trailblazers program focuses on communication, problem solving, and procedural knowledge related to mathematics.

The Milford School District has been a partner in the state's Science Coalition for eight years. All of our classroom teachers have been trained to use the Smithsonian science kits to teach science. The science instruction involves the students in hands-on learning experiences that engage the students in the use of scientific processes. The students actively participate in making observations, creating hypotheses, conducting experiments, drawing conclusions, and writing and talking about their findings.

The Milford School District has recently adopted new social studies curricula for the elementary levels. Second and third grade teach social studies through a hands-on literature-based approach using purchased units from the George F. Cram Company. The units correlate well with the state standards in the four areas of social studies – geography, civics, history and economics. The fourth and fifth grade teachers have served on teams to write units of study for the social studies curriculum. Each of the 11 units is based on a period of United States history and incorporates hands-on lessons addressing the state standards in geography, civics, and economics. There are lessons in each unit addressing events in our state's history during that same time period. Inquiry-based research projects are an important component of the units.

In addition to the core curricular areas discussed above, Ross School students regularly participate in classes for physical education, technology education, affective education, and art (focusing on the Multiple Intelligences). The Library Media Specialist assists teachers in the implementation of research-based activities in the library and provides instruction to students in the use of the available databases. The use of technology is infused throughout the curriculum, and our full-time Instructional Technology Specialist is in the process of developing a sequence of technology skills to be taught at each grade level. Health education is integrated into other areas of the curriculum, in addition to the inclusion of six weekly "Think First" safety lessons sponsored by our local hospital. Our guidance counselor coordinates our Drug-Free program. Finally, we conduct an after-school tutorial program for students who need extra time to meet their goals.

Lulu Ross Elementary School's Reading Curriculum

In keeping with the research in reading that states that no one approach to teaching reading works for all students, we choose to use a variety of reading materials in each classroom to meet the needs of each individual student in mastering the Delaware state standards. These materials include the 2002 Scott Foresman Reading Series that teaches both phonics skills and comprehension strategies. Trade books are used to analyze authors' style and content. Soar to Success materials are used with small groups of students who are reading a ½ year below grade level. Additionally, we use the Accelerated Reader program for independent, on-level reading to reinforce skills and strategies learned and to build fluency. Students are highly motivated to read as a result.

Our instructional practices mirror the same sentiment that no one method works for all. As a result, we provide whole group, small group and individual instruction to students. An intervention time is built into each day allowing teachers and instructional support staff to work with children in small groups on specific areas of need. This may include using Soar to Success materials to teach specific comprehension strategies (questioning, predicting, clarifying, summarizing) through the model of reciprocal teaching. For students reading on or above grade level, this time is often used to meet in Book Clubs to apply strategies through discussion groups. Additionally, teachers meet with each student weekly to assess how well they are reading independently and to check to see which strategies are being used. Our Reading Specialist rotates through all the classrooms every six weeks to model specific reading comprehension lessons.

During the summer of 2001, a committee of teachers met to critique potential reading curriculum materials. From the seven programs reviewed, the committee chose two: the Scott Foresman Reading Series and the Houghton Mifflin Reading Series. Throughout the 2001-2002 school year, these two reading series were piloted (each grade level had a pilot teacher for each reading series) and the teachers reported back to their grade level teammates. A formal presentation was made in the spring and 95% of the staff voted in the selection of the Scott Foresman Reading Series. Some of the strengths of this program include: weekly paired readings (one fiction and one nonfiction selection on similar topics); spiraling instruction of comprehension strategies; and weekly on-topic leveled readers to support students below, on and above reading level.

Math Curriculum

The mission of Ross School is for all students, staff, and families to work together to continually improve academic performance and citizenship. Our Trailblazers Math Curriculum, which is a NSF-TIMS program for students from kindergarten to fifth grade, supports this mission. The program focuses on communication, problem-solving, and procedural knowledge. The Trailblazer program spirals to allow students to achieve mastery of mathematical concepts at their own learning pace. The program allows for discovery learning as it is based on kinesthetic principles. Students often work in cooperative groups which aids in improving citizenship. To encourage families to understand and be involved with our math program, we have conducted math nights as well as involving them in improving math communication through the use of parent/student homework. The primary goal of this curriculum is to create an educational experience that results in children who enjoy mathematics, who are comfortable and flexible mathematic thinkers, and see connections between the math they do in school and the thinking they do in everyday life. During Instructional Support Time (referred to as IST) at Ross, grade level teams collaborate to improve mathematics instruction for all students. We discuss pacing, assessments, and strategies to promote high student achievement.

Instructional Methods

Throughout a student's tenure at Ross School, he/she experiences a variety of instructional methods that are designed to best meet the needs of each student. All students participate in whole group instruction across content areas as they are introduced to new concepts and learn how new strategies are used through teacher modeling. Students also learn through small/cooperative learning groups as they communicate their shared understanding with their peers (following the philosophy that students retain more when they must teach/tell others). Small group instruction is also used to target specific skills and strategies needed by select students. Often this occurs during the intervention block (30 minutes per grade level when teachers review/extend

information), after school tutoring, academically talented pull-out groups, ESL instruction, and Title I math and reading. During independent work, students apply their new knowledge and skills through practice. Students also participate in some one-on-one instruction as needed from instructional specialists, after school tutoring, and during the HOSTS (Helping One Student to Succeed) tutoring program.

Teachers instruct students through explicit, implicit, and direct instruction in all content areas. The math Trailblazers curriculum introduces different math concepts in a spiraling approach. Students practice the concepts throughout the school year and across the grades as concepts are built on previous learning. This also occurs through the Scott Foresman reading curriculum and the Smithsonian Kit science curriculum. Students continually learn about and apply many reading skills and strategies within and across grade levels. To balance this model, students also learn and apply each strategy more in depth through extended instruction on a specific strategy. For instance, in using the Six Traits Plus One model of writing, students focus on one trait/quality of writing at a time until they become proficient. Then they focus on the next. This is true also in their study of reading comprehension. Students focus on one strategy at a time (e.g., inferring) until they become proficient in their use, then build on this knowledge as they focus on the next strategy. Our teachers constantly analyze the assessment data in order to adapt their instruction to meet the needs of the students.

Students also experience the teaching expertise of several educators through the team teaching model. Some classrooms integrate general needs students with special needs students and have two teachers part or all of the day. Additionally, all students experience learning from five instructional specialists (reading, writing, science, media and technology) who visit each classroom teaching lessons in their content area. By providing many modalities of instruction, our students are supported in their individual growth as learners.

Professional Development Program and Its Impact on Achievement

Ross teachers and paraprofessionals participate in professional development through a variety of ways. Our school is a Professional Development School in a partnership with the University of Delaware. As a Professional Development School, we are focused on learning at all levels, including the learning of students, teachers, support staff, and administrators. Because we are a Professional Development School in a partnership with the University, our teachers have the opportunity to participate in graduate level courses on our campus. During the 2003-2004 school year, an entire grade level team voluntarily enrolled in a course related to inquiry-based research. Two other teachers are enrolled in a course related to action research.

All teachers receive formal training when new curricula are adopted and ongoing support during the implementation. In addition to professional development to support school-wide initiatives, (e.g., Six Plus One Traits, Trailblazers, AR, AM, Standards Master, etc.), much of the professional development conducted at Ross develops from instructional needs identified through the implementation of the Baldrige processes. Our reading and writing specialists provide model lessons to classes on a rotating basis while teachers observe and provide support to the students. The specialists then provide the teachers with opportunities to request further assistance as needed. In addition, grade level teams meet one day per week during Instructional Support Time (35 minutes of common planning time during the school day) to discuss ways to improve instruction and learning. In addition, during IST on other days, there is time for collaboration among members of the team or with the specialists. In the area of math, all teachers participate in formal Trailblazer training and are then supported by the assistance of a Lead Teacher for each grade level. The Lead Teachers are supported at the district and state levels. Ross School is fortunate to have the support of a full-time Writing Specialist and Instructional Technology Specialist (through the Enhancing Education through Technology grant), a Reading Specialist, a Library Media Specialist, and the support services of the district Reading and Science Specialists. During the 2002-2003 and 2003-2004 school years, Ross School has been a partner with another Delaware school (Brader Elementary) as we have piloted the Four Blocks framework for reading instruction. Teachers from Ross have observed Brader teachers in action, and representatives of Brader have provided workshops and modeling for our teachers on-site at Ross. All classroom teachers participate in extensive training before teaching the Science Smithsonian kits. The principal and assistant principal continually participate in professional development through the Delaware Principals' Academy and professional organizations to which they belong. At Ross School, everyone is a learner!

11

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

<u>Delaware State Testing Program</u> A Criterion Referenced Assessment

This overview applies to:	Table 1a	Reading Grade 3	page	15
	Table 1b	Reading Grade 5	page	16
	Table 1c	Math Grade 3	page	17
	Table 1d	Math Grade 5	page	18
	Table 1e	Writing Grade 3	page	19
	Table 1f	Writing Grade 5	page	20

Grade 3, 5 (end of standards cluster years)

Test Delaware State Testing Program

Edition/publication year 1996 Publisher Harcourt Educational Measurement Systems

Note: School Year 2002-2003 was the first year for Grade 5 students to attend Ross Elementary. Therefore, only the testing results for grade 5 students in 2002-2003 are reported in the following data reporting tables.

The number of students in each grade and the number taking the test are listed in each data table.

No groups or subpopulations are excluded from testing.

DSTP Student Performance levels and cut scores have been established by Delaware educators and community members. The cut-scores were approved by the Delaware State Board of Education in September, 1999.

There are five performance levels defined for reading, mathematics and writing. They are:

DSTP Student Performance Levels						
Level	Category	Description				
5	Distinguished	Excellent Performance				
4	Exceeds the Standard	Very Good Performance				
3	Meets the Standard	Good Performance				
2	Below the Standard	Needs Improvement				
1	Well Below the Standard	Needs Significant Improvement				

In the following data reporting tables these levels have been re-categorized as follows:

Exceeds = Levels 4 and 5 Meets = Level 3 Below Standard = Level 1 and 2

The cut scores for the DSTP are provided in the tables at the bottom of each content area and grade level chart.

Lulu Ross Elementary Table 1a
Delaware State Testing Program - Reading- Grade 3
Criterion-Referenced Testing developed by the state and Harcourt Education Measurements Systems

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing Month	March	March	March	April	April
READING SCORES ROSS GR 3				-	
TOTAL					
At or Above Well Below the Standard	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
At or Above Below the Standard	96.1%	91.6%	91.4%	90.0%	82.7%
At or Above Meets the Standard	85.3%	80.1%	77.0%	70.0%	69.3%
At or Above Exceeds the Standard	33.3%	32.5%	25.9%	15.4%	19.3%
Distinguished	11.6%	13.3%	12.2%	5.4%	11.3%
Number of Students Tested	129	166	139	130	154
Percent of Total Students Tested	100.0%	99.4%	99.3%	99.2%	100.0%
Number of Students Excluded	0	1	1	1	0
Percentage of Students Excluded	0.0%	0.6%	0.7%	0.8%	0.0%
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Low income # in population	55	67	53	58	55
At or Above Well Below the Standard	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
At or Above Below the Standard	94.6%	85.1%	81.1%	87.9%	67.3%
At or Above Meets the Standard	81.8%	68.7%	60.4%	60.3%	52.7%
At or Above Exceeds the Standard	9.1%	19.4%	11.3%	10.3%	5.5%
Distinguished	9.1%	4.5%	1.9%	5.2%	1.8%
Low income mean scaled score	435.2	427.9	418.1	420.5	410.2
2. Not Low Income # in population	74	99	86	72	95
At or Above Well Below the Standard	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
At or Above Below the Standard	97.3%	96.0%	97.7%	91.7%	91.6%
At or Above Meets the Standard	87.8%	87.9%	87.2%	77.8%	79.0%
At or Above Exceeds the Standard	51.4%	41.4%	34.9%	19.5%	27.4%
Distinguished	31.1%	19.2%	21.0%	13.9%	11.6%
Not Low income mean scaled score	462.1	453.4	450.6	437.4	436.5
3. African American # in population	28	38	33	38	30
At or Above Well Below the Standard	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
At or Above Below the Standard	92.6%	81.6%	78.8%	81.6%	50.0%
At or Above Meets the Standard	82.1%	55.3%	54.5%	42.1%	33.3%
At or Above Exceeds the Standard	14.3%	18.4%	6.1%	5.3%	3.3%
Distinguished	3.6%	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
African American mean scaled score	434.8	424.0	412.7	411.1	392.8
4. Hispanic # in population	4	8	0	12	6 2
5. Asian-American # in population Scores for subpopulations with n<1	•	v	v	hu tha Stata	
	88			by the state.	79 114
6. White # in population	100.0%			100	
At or Above Well Below the Standard			100.0%	100.	
At or Above Below the Standard	96.6%		96.0%		7% 90.4%
At or Above Meets the Standard	85.2%		85.2%		3% 79.0%
At or Above Exceeds the Standard	42.1%		32.7%		5% 24.6%
Distinguished	28.4%		18.8%		2% 10.5%
White mean scaled score	456.7	450.2	447.5	43	39.8 436.4
STATE SCORES					
Total					
At or Above Well Below the Standard	100.0%		100.0%	100.	.0% 100.0%
At or Above Below the Standard	91.8%	91.1%	88.9%	89.	.6% 84.0%
At or Above Meets the Standard	79.3%	79.3%	74.1%	76.	8% 68.6%
At or Above Exceeds the Standard	29.6%	28.8%	23.4%	24.	2% 20.9%
Distinguished	14.3%	13.6%	10.4%	12.	.4% 9.2%
State mean scaled score	442.5		435.2		37.2 428.1
School mean scaled score	450.6		438.2		29.9 426.8
Cut Scores- DSTP Reading Grade 3 (lowest scaled					
Grade Grade	Below	Meets	Exceeds	Distinguished	
3	387.0	411.0	465.0	482.0	
<u> </u>				.02.0	

Lulu Ross Elementary Table 1b Delaware State Testing Program - Reading- Grade 5 Criterion-Referenced Testing developed by the state and Harcourt Education Measurements Systems

Criterion-Referenced Testing developed							
2002-2003 was the first ye		5 was at Lulu F	Koss Elementary				
Testing M READING SCORES ROSS GR 5	iontn			March 2003			
Total							
At or Above Well Below the Standard				100.0%			
At or Above Below the Standard At or Above Below the Standard				97.1%			
At or Above Meets the Standard							
At or Above Exceeds the Standard				85.7% 32.1%			
Distinguished				17.1%			
Number of Students Tested				140			
Percent of Total Students Tested				100%			
Number of Students Excluded				0%			
Percentage of Students Excluded				0%			
SUBGROUP SCORES							
1. Low income # in population				57			
At or Above Well Below the Standard				100.0%			
At or Above Below the Standard				96.5%			
At or Above Meets the Standard				80.7%			
At or Above Exceeds the Standard				15.8%			
Distinguished				7.0%			
Low income mean scaled score				498.8			
2. Not Low Income # in population At or Above Well Below the Standard				83 100.0%			
At or Above Below the Standard At or Above Below the Standard				97.6%			
At or Above Meets the Standard				89.2%			
At or Above Exceeds the Standard				43.4%			
Distinguished				20.5%			
Not Low income mean scaled score				477.8			
3. African American # in population				32			
At or Above Well Below the Standard				100.0%			
At or Above Below the Standard				93.8%			
At or Above Meets the Standard				75.0%			
At or Above Exceeds the Standard				18.8%			
Distinguished				6.3%			
African American mean scaled score				475.8			
4. Hispanic # in population				7			
5. Asian-American # in population				2			
Scores for subpopulations with n<15 a	are not statisticall	significant and are	not reported by the S				
5. White # in population				99			
At or Above Well Below the Standard				100.0%			
At or Above Below the Standard				98.0%			
At or Above Meets the Standard				88.9%			
At or Above Exceeds the Standard				37.4%			
Distinguished				17.2%			
White mean scaled score				495.8			
STATE SCORES							
Total							
At or Above Well Below the Standard				100.0%			
At or Above Below the Standard				92.9%			
At or Above Meets the Standard				78.5%			
At or Above Exceeds the Standard				23.4%			
Distinguished				8.7%			
State mean scaled score				479.7			
School mean scaled score				490.2			
Cut Scores- DSTP Reading Grade 5 (lowest scale	ed score a student	can earn and still be					
Grade		1	1				
5	Below	Meets	Exceeds 508	Distinguished 529			

Lulu Ross Elementary Table 1c Delaware State Testing Program - Mathematics- Grade 3 Criterion-Referenced Testing developed by the state and Harcourt Education Measurements Systems

Criterion-Referenced Testing develo	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing Month	March	March	March		
MATH SCORES ROSS GR 3	March	Maich	Maich	April	April
Total At or Above Well Below the Standard	100.0%	100.00/	100.00/	100.0%	100.00/
		100.0%	100.0%		100.0%
At or Above Below the Standard	97.0%	95.7%	89.2%	87.8%	82.0%
At or Above Meets the Standard	88.0%	78.5%	73.4%	61.8%	69.3%
At or Above Exceeds the Standard	39.9%	29.4%	20.9%	11.5%	17.3%
Distinguished	12.0%	6.1%	7.9%	0.8%	5.3%
Number of Students Tested	129	166	139	130	154
Percent of Total Students Tested	100.0%	99.4%	99.3%	99.2%	100.0%
Number of Students Excluded	0	1	1	1	0
Percentage of Students Excluded	0.0%	0.6%	0.7%	0.8%	0.0%
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Low income # in population	57	63	54	59	55
At or Above Well Below the Standard	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
At or Above Below the Standard	94.7%	92.1%	77.8%	84.7%	67.3%
At or Above Meets the Standard	82.5%	69.8%	61.1%	49.2%	50.9%
At or Above Exceeds the Standard	19.3%	17.5%	5.6%	6.8%	9.1%
Distinguished	3.5%	3.2%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%
Low income mean scaled score	438.4	428.5	415.0	409.9	406.9
2. Not Low Income # in population	76	100	85	72	95
At or Above Well Below the Standard	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
At or Above Below the Standard	98.7%	98.0%	96.5%	90.3%	90.5%
At or Above Meets the Standard	92.1%	84.0%	81.2%	72.2%	80.0%
At or Above Exceeds the Standard	55.3%	37.0%	30.6%	15.3%	22.1%
Distinguished	18.4%	8.0%	12.9%	1.4%	7.4%
Not Low income mean scaled score	465.2	448.4	445.6	426.8	434.8
3. African American # in population	29	38	33	38	30
At or Above Well Below the Standard	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
At or Above Below the Standard	93.1%	92.1%	75.8%	73.7%	46.7%
At or Above Meets the Standard	79.3%	71.1%	51.5%	47.4%	33.3%
At or Above Exceeds the Standard	20.7%	18.4%	3.0%	2.6%	3.3%
Distinguished	20.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.3%
African American mean scaled score	434.8	421.7	408.1	402.8	388.2
4. Hispanic # in population	9	8	4	12	6
5. Asian-American # in population	4	0	0	1	2
Scores for subpopulations with				rted by the State.	
6. White # in population	91	119	101	79	114
At or Above Well Below the Standard	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
At or Above Below the Standard	97.8%	96.6%	93.1%	94.9%	91.2%
At or Above Meets the Standard	89.0%	79.8%	79.2%	72.2%	79.0%
At or Above Exceeds the Standard	47.3%	33.6%	26.7%	15.2%	21.9%
Distinguished	14.3%	8.4%	10.9%	1.3%	6.1%
White mean scaled score	456.7	447.0%	441.6%	428.0%	435.1%
STATE SCORES					
Total					
At or Above Well Below the Standard	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
At or Above Below the Standard	89.9%	88.9%	87.0%	89.6%	82.5%
At or Above Meets the Standard	73.6%	72.0%	71.3%	72.7%	63.5%
At or Above Exceeds the Standard	25.0%	26.2%	21.9%	20.8%	14.5%
Distinguished	6.8%	6.8%	6.0%	5.4%	3.7%
State mean scaled score	434.8	434.1	430.0	431.1	421.2
School mean scaled score	453.7	440.7	433.7	419.2	424.5
Cut Scores- DSTP Math Grade 3				he indicated performa	nce level)
Grade	Below	Meets	Exceeds	Distinguished	
3	427	451	508	529	

Lulu Ross Elementary Table 1d
Delaware State Testing Program - Mathematics- Grade 5
Criterion-Referenced Testing developed by the state and Harcourt Education Measurements Systems

	nced Testing devel					
	02-2003 was the fi	rst year that Grad	de 5 was at Lulu		U	
Testing Month	CD 5			March	1 2003	
MATH SCORES ROSS	GR 5					
Total						
	Below the Standard	<u>d</u>			100.0%	
At or Above Belov					90.6%	
At or Above Meets					76.5%	
At or Above Excee	eds the Standard				23.5% 5.4%	
	Distinguished					
Number of Students					149	
Percent of Total Stud	ents Tested				100%	
Number of Students 1	Excluded				0%	
Percentage of Studen	ts Excluded				0%	
SUBGROUP SCORE	ES					
1. Low income # in popu	alation				65	
	Below the Standard	1			100.0%	
At or Above Below					86.2%	
At or Above Meets					64.6%	
At or Above Excee					13.9%	
Distinguished	AG the Standard				0.0%	
Low income mean sca	aled score				459.4	
2. Not Low Income # in					84	
	Below the Standard	1			100.0%	
At or Above Below		<u> </u>			94.0%	
At or Above Meets					85.7%	
At or Above Excee					31.0%	
Distinguished	as the Standard				9.5%	
	1 . 1					
Not Low income mea					483.4	
3. African American # in		1			34	
	Below the Standard	1			100.0%	
At or Above Below					79.4%	
At or Above Meets					52.9%	
At or Above Excee	ds the Standard				11.8%	
Distinguished					0.0%	
African American me					453.9	
4. Hispanic # in populat					7	
5. Asian-American # in	population				2	
Scores for s	ubpopulations with n	<15 are not statistic	ally significant and	are not reported by	the State.	
6. White # in population					105	
	Below the Standard	i			100.0%	
At or Above Below					93.3%	
At or Above Meets					83.8%	
At or Above Excee	eds the Standard				26.7%	
Distinguished White mean scaled sc	0.00				7.6% 499.2	
STATE SCORES	oie				499.2	
Total						
	Below the Standard	1			100.0%	
At or Above Below		*			88.7%	
At or Above Meets					71.0%	
At or Above Excee					17.8%	
Distinguished					6.6%	
State mean scaled sco		<u> </u>			468	
School mean scaled scor					473	
	OSTP Math Grade			be within the indicated p		
Grade		Below	Meets	Exceeds	Distinguished	
	5	424	449	503	525	

Lulu Ross Elementary Table 1e
Delaware State Testing Program - Writing- Grade 3
Criterion-Referenced Testing developed by the state and Harcourt Education Measurements Systems

Criterion-Referenced Testing developed	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing Month	March	March	March	April	April
WRITING SCORES ROSS GR 3	Waten	Iviaicii	Maich	April	Арт
Total					
At or Above Well Below the Standard	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
At or Above Well Below the Standard At or Above Below the Standard	80.5%	89.6%	83.6%	79.7%	78.3%
At or Above Meets the Standard At or Above Meets the Standard	33.8%	34.1%	36.4%	19.5%	43.5%
At or Above Exceeds the Standard	0.0%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	4.3%
Distinguished	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%
Number of Students Tested	129	166	139	130	154
Percent of Total Students Tested	100.0%	99.4%	99.3%	99.2%	100.0%
Number of Students Excluded	0	77.4/0	77.3/0	99.2/0 1	0
Percentage of Students Excluded	0.0%	0.6%	0.7%	0.8%	0.0%
SUBGROUP SCORES	0.070	0.070	0.770	0.070	0.070
1. Low income # in population					
At or Above Well Below the Standard	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
At or Above Below the Standard At or Above Below the Standard	79.0%	81.7%	70.4%	78.0%	65.3%
At or Above Meets the Standard At or Above Meets the Standard	28.1%	23.9%	24.1%	18.0%	34.7%
At or Above Exceeds the Standard	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Distinguished	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Low income mean scaled score	5.5	5.6	5.2	5.3	5.4
2. Not Low Income # in population	76	102	68	86	89
At or Above Well Below the Standard	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
At or Above Below the Standard At or Above Below the Standard	81.6%	95.1%	91.9%	80.9%	85.4%
At or Above Meets the Standard	38.2%	41.2%	44.2%	20.6%	48.3%
At or Above Exceeds the Standard	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.7%
Distinguished	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%
Not Low income mean scaled score	6.0	6.4	6.5	5.4	6.7
3. African American # in population	24	38	33	30	24
At or Above Well Below the Standard	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
At or Above Below the Standard	75.9%	71.1%	66.7%	76.7%	62.5%
At or Above Meets the Standard	27.6%	21.1%	21.2%	6.7%	37.5%
At or Above Exceeds the Standard	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Distinguished	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
African American mean scaled score	5.5	5	5	5	6
4. Hispanic # in population	9	8	4	12	6
5. Asian-American # in population	4	0	0	1	2
Scores for subpopulations with n<15 a	ire not statisticall	y significant and	are not reported	l by the State.	_
6. White # in population	91	121	102	75	108
At or Above Well Below the Standard	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
At or Above Below the Standard	83.5%	94.2%	89.2%	81.3%	83.3%
At or Above Meets the Standard	35.2%	37.2%	41.2%	22.7%	45.4%
At or Above Exceeds the Standard	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	5.6%
Distinguished	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%
White mean scaled score	5.9	6.3	6.3	5.5	6.4
STATE SCORES					
Total					
At or Above Well Below the Standard	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
At or Above Below the Standard	74.6%	88.4%	81.9%	85.7%	82.4%
At or Above Meets the Standard	39.1%	45.6%	32.8%	36.9%	48.7%
At or Above Exceeds the Standard	0.9%	1.8%	0.4%	0.6%	1.9%
Distinguished	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%
State mean scaled score	5.8	6.4	5.9	6.1	6.4
School mean scaled score	5.8	6.1	6.0	5.3	6.2
Cut Scores- DSTP Writing Grade 3 (lowest scaled sc	ore a student can ear	n and still be with	in the indicated per	rformance level)	
Grade	Below	Meets	Exceeds	Disting	guished
3	5	7	11	13	
<u> </u>	ı -	1 '	1	1.5	

Lulu Ross Elementary Table 1f Delaware State Testing Program - Writing- Grade 5 Criterion-Referenced Testing developed by the state and Harcourt Education Measurements Systems

Testing Month WRITING SCORES ROSS GR 5 Total At or Above Well Below the Standard At or Above Below the Standard At or Above Meets the Standard At or Above Exceeds the Standard Distinguished Number of Students Tested Percent of Total Students Tested Number of Students Excluded Percentage of Students Excluded Percentage of Students Excluded SUBGROUP SCORES 1. Low income # in population At or Above Well Below the Standard At or Above Below the Standard At or Above Meets the Standard At or Above Exceeds the Standard Distinguished Low income mean scaled score			Ma	100.0% 98.0% 61.1% 3.4% 0.0% 149 100% 0% 65 100.0% 96.9% 44.6% 1.5% 0.0%
Total At or Above Well Below the Standard At or Above Below the Standard At or Above Meets the Standard At or Above Exceeds the Standard Distinguished Number of Students Tested Percent of Total Students Tested Number of Students Excluded Percentage of Students Excluded SUBGROUP SCORES 1. Low income # in population At or Above Well Below the Standard At or Above Below the Standard At or Above Meets the Standard Distinguished				98.0% 61.1% 3.4% 0.0% 149 100% 0% 0% 65 100.0% 96.9% 44.6% 1.5% 0.0%
At or Above Well Below the Standard At or Above Below the Standard At or Above Meets the Standard At or Above Exceeds the Standard Distinguished Number of Students Tested Percent of Total Students Tested Number of Students Excluded Percentage of Students Excluded SUBGROUP SCORES 1. Low income # in population At or Above Well Below the Standard At or Above Below the Standard At or Above Meets the Standard At or Above Exceeds the Standard Distinguished				98.0% 61.1% 3.4% 0.0% 149 100% 0% 0% 65 100.0% 96.9% 44.6% 1.5% 0.0%
At or Above Below the Standard At or Above Meets the Standard At or Above Exceeds the Standard Distinguished Number of Students Tested Percent of Total Students Tested Number of Students Excluded Percentage of Students Excluded SUBGROUP SCORES 1. Low income # in population At or Above Well Below the Standard At or Above Below the Standard At or Above Meets the Standard At or Above Exceeds the Standard Distinguished				98.0% 61.1% 3.4% 0.0% 149 100% 0% 0% 65 100.0% 96.9% 44.6% 1.5% 0.0%
At or Above Meets the Standard At or Above Exceeds the Standard Distinguished Number of Students Tested Percent of Total Students Tested Number of Students Excluded Percentage of Students Excluded SUBGROUP SCORES 1. Low income # in population At or Above Well Below the Standard At or Above Below the Standard At or Above Meets the Standard At or Above Exceeds the Standard Distinguished				61.1% 3.4% 0.0% 149 100% 0% 65 100.0% 96.9% 44.6% 1.5% 0.0%
At or Above Exceeds the Standard Distinguished Number of Students Tested Percent of Total Students Tested Number of Students Excluded Percentage of Students Excluded SUBGROUP SCORES 1. Low income # in population At or Above Well Below the Standard At or Above Below the Standard At or Above Meets the Standard At or Above Exceeds the Standard Distinguished				3.4% 0.0% 149 100% 0% 0% 65 100.0% 96.9% 44.6% 1.5% 0.0%
Distinguished Number of Students Tested Percent of Total Students Tested Number of Students Excluded Percentage of Students Excluded SUBGROUP SCORES 1. Low income # in population At or Above Well Below the Standard At or Above Below the Standard At or Above Meets the Standard At or Above Exceeds the Standard Distinguished				0.0% 149 100% 0% 0% 65 100.0% 96.9% 44.6% 1.5% 0.0%
Number of Students Tested Percent of Total Students Tested Number of Students Excluded Percentage of Students Excluded SUBGROUP SCORES 1. Low income # in population At or Above Well Below the Standard At or Above Below the Standard At or Above Meets the Standard At or Above Exceeds the Standard Distinguished				149 100% 0% 0% 65 100.0% 96.9% 44.6% 1.5% 0.0%
Percent of Total Students Tested Number of Students Excluded Percentage of Students Excluded SUBGROUP SCORES 1. Low income # in population At or Above Well Below the Standard At or Above Below the Standard At or Above Meets the Standard At or Above Exceeds the Standard Distinguished				100% 0% 0% 06 65 100.0% 96.9% 44.6% 1.5% 0.0%
Number of Students Excluded Percentage of Students Excluded SUBGROUP SCORES 1. Low income # in population At or Above Well Below the Standard At or Above Below the Standard At or Above Meets the Standard At or Above Exceeds the Standard Distinguished				0% 0% 65 100.0% 96.9% 44.6% 1.5% 0.0%
Percentage of Students Excluded SUBGROUP SCORES 1. Low income # in population At or Above Well Below the Standard At or Above Below the Standard At or Above Meets the Standard At or Above Exceeds the Standard Distinguished				0% 65 100.0% 96.9% 44.6% 1.5% 0.0%
SUBGROUP SCORES 1. Low income # in population At or Above Well Below the Standard At or Above Below the Standard At or Above Meets the Standard At or Above Exceeds the Standard Distinguished				65 100.0% 96.9% 44.6% 1.5% 0.0%
1. Low income # in population At or Above Well Below the Standard At or Above Below the Standard At or Above Meets the Standard At or Above Exceeds the Standard Distinguished				100.0% 96.9% 44.6% 1.5% 0.0%
At or Above Well Below the Standard At or Above Below the Standard At or Above Meets the Standard At or Above Exceeds the Standard Distinguished				100.0% 96.9% 44.6% 1.5% 0.0%
At or Above Below the Standard At or Above Meets the Standard At or Above Exceeds the Standard Distinguished				96.9% 44.6% 1.5% 0.0%
At or Above Meets the Standard At or Above Exceeds the Standard Distinguished				44.6% 1.5% 0.0%
At or Above Exceeds the Standard Distinguished				1.5% 0.0%
Distinguished				0.0%
1)				
				/.1
2. Not Low Income # in population				84
At or Above Well Below the Standard			- 	100.0%
At or Above Below the Standard At or Above Below the Standard				98.8%
At or Above Meets the Standard At or Above Meets the Standard				73.8%
At or Above Exceeds the Standard				4.8%
Distinguished				0.0%
Not Low income mean scaled score				7.8
3. African American # in population				34
At or Above Well Below the Standard				100.0%
At or Above Below the Standard				97.1%
At or Above Meets the Standard				44.1%
At or Above Exceeds the Standard				2.9%
Distinguished				0.0%
African American mean scaled score				7.1
4. Hispanic # in population				8
5. Asian-American # in population				2
Scores for subpopulations with n<15 are not sta	atistically s	ignificant and ar	e not reported by the	State.
6. White # in population	•	-		105
At or Above Well Below the Standard				100.0%
At or Above Below the Standard				98.1%
At or Above Meets the Standard				67.6%
At or Above Exceeds the Standard				3.8%
Distinguished				0.0%
White mean scaled score				7.7
STATE SCORES				
Total				
At or Above Well Below the Standard				100.0%
At or Above Below the Standard				92.6%
At or Above Meets the Standard				60.0%
At or Above Exceeds the Standard				4.3%
Distinguished				0.3%
State mean scaled score				7.3
School mean scaled score				7.5
Cut Scores- DSTP Writing Grade 5 (lowest scaled score a stu				
Grade Belo	W	Meets	Exceeds	Distinguished
5 6		8	11	13

Grades 2-5 Te

Test – Stanford Achievement Test (SAT-9)

Edition/publication year – 1996 Publisher – Harcourt Educational Measurement Systems

No groups or subpopulations are excluded from testing.

Scores reported as: NCE <u>x</u> Scaled scores Percentiles

The state of Delaware did not test "off grades" (grades 2 and 4) on the SAT-9 prior to the 2001-2002 school year, thus the data reporting tables for those two grades will only reflect the test results in reading comprehension and math problem solving for tests taken in 2002 and 2003. In addition, the 2002-03 school year was the first year for the 5th grade to be located at Ross, therefore only the results for this year are available. The complete data set for grade 3 is available and is reported in the indicated tables.

This overview applies to: Table 2a Reading Grade 2 page 22

rabie za	Reading Grade 2	page	22
Table 2b	Reading Grade 3	page	23
Table 2c	Reading Grade 4	page	24
Table 2d	Reading Grade 5	page	25
Table 2e	Math Grade 2	page	26
Table 2f	Math Grade 3	page	27
Table 2g	Math Grade 4	page	28
Table 2h	Math Grade 5	page	29

Lulu Ross Elementary Table 2a Nationally Normed Measure Reading Comprehension

Grade 2 Stanford Achievement Test - SAT-9

Edition/Publication Year: 1996 Publisher: Harcourt Educational Measurement

Systems

Scores are reported as: NCE's X	Scaled S	Scores	Percentiles			
_	2002-	2001-	2000-	1999-	1998-	
	2003	2002	2001	2000	1999	
Testing Month	March	March	March	April	April	
Reading Comprehension- Ross Elementary						
Mean NCE Score	60.4	59.1	**	**	**	
Number of students tested	165	146	**	**	**	
Percent of students tested	100%	100%	**	**	**	
Number of students excluded	0	0	**	**	**	
Percentage of students excluded	0%	0%	**	**	**	
SUBGROUP SCORES			**	**	**	
1. African American	53.7	50.9	**	**	**	
2. Caucasian	64.7	61.2	**	**	**	
State Scores						
State Mean NCE Score	NA*	NA*	**	**	**	

^{*}The State does not publish this data

^{**}State did not test in this year for off grades (2 and4)

Lulu Ross Elementary Table 2b Nationally Normed Measure Reading Comprehension

Grade 3 Stanford Achievement Test - SAT-9

Edition/Publication Year: 1996 Publisher: Harcourt Educational Measurement

Systems

Scores are reported as: NCE's X	Scaled S	cores	Percentiles		
	2002-	2001-	2000-	1999-	1998-
	2003	2002	2001	2000	1999
Testing Month	March	March	March	April	April
Reading Comprehension- Ross Elementary					
Mean NCE Score	62.7	60.5	59.6	54.9	54.3
Number of students tested	133	166	139	130	150
Percent of students tested	100.0%	99.4%	99.3%	99.2%	100.0%
Number of students excluded	0.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.0
Percent of students excluded	0.0%	0.6%	0.7%	0.8%	0.0%
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. African American	52.0	51.0	47.2	43.6	37.9
2. Caucasian	65.0	63.4	64.0	61.1	58.9
State Scores					
State Mean NCE Score	59.3	58.6	57.5	56.6	47.3

Lulu Ross Elementary Table 2c Nationally Normed Measure Reading Comprehension

Grade 4 Stanford Achievement Test - SAT-9

Edition/Publication Year: 1996 Publisher: Harcourt Educational Measurement

Systems

Scores are reported as: NCE's X	Scaled S	Scores	Percentiles		
•	2002-	2001-	2000-	1999-	1998-
	2003	2002	2001	2000	1999
Testing Month	March	March	March	April	April
Reading Comprehension- Ross Elementary					
Mean NCE Score	57.1	55.3	**	**	**
Number of students tested	159	156	**	**	**
Percent of students tested	98.1%	100.0%	**	**	**
Number of students excluded	3.0	0.0	**	**	**
Percent of students excluded	1.9%	0.0%	**	**	**
SUBGROUP SCORES			**	**	**
1. African American	47.8	46.7	**	**	**
2. Caucasian	56.8	58.8	**	**	**
State Scores					
State Mean NCE Score	NA*	NA*	**	**	**

^{*}The State does not publish this data

^{**}State did not test in this year for off grades (2 and4)

Lulu Ross Elementary Table 2d Nationally Normed Measure Reading Comprehension

Grade 5 Stanford Achievement Test - SAT-9

Edition/Publication Year: 1996 Publisher: Harcourt Educational Measurement

Systems

Scores are reported as: NCE's X	Scaled S	cores	Percentiles		
	2002-	2001-	2000-	1999-	1998-
	2003	2002	2001	2000	1999
Testing Month	March	March	March	April	April
Reading Comprehension- Ross Elementary					
Mean NCE Score	59.1	*	*	*	*
Number of students tested	149	*	*	*	*
Percent of students tested	100.0%	*	*	*	*
Number of students excluded	0.0	*	*	*	*
Percent of students excluded	0.0%	*	*	*	*
SUBGROUP SCORES		*	*	*	*
1. African American	48.8	*	*	*	*
2. Caucasian	61.8	*	*	*	*
State Scores					
State Mean NCE Score	55.1	*	*	*	*

^{*}Ross students located at other schools.

Lulu Ross Elementary Table 2e Nationally Normed Measure Math Problem Solving

Grade 2 Stanford Achievement Test - SAT-9

Edition/publication Year: 1996 Publisher: Harcourt Educational Measurement

Systems

Scores are reported as: NCE's X	Scaled Sc	ores Pe	ercentiles		
-	2002-	2001-	2000-	1999-	1998-
	2003	2002	2001	2000	1999
Testing Month	March	March	March	April	April
Reading Comprehension- Ross Elementary					
Mean NCE Score	55.3	52.8	**	**	**
Number of students tested	165	146	**	**	**
Percent of students tested	100%	100%	**	**	**
Number of students excluded	0	0	**	**	**
Percentage of students excluded	0%	0%	**	**	**
SUBGROUP SCORES			**	**	**
1. African American	49.6	44.7	**	**	**
2. Caucasian	60.0	55.2	**	**	**
State Scores	_	_		_	
State Mean NCE Score	NA*	NA*	**	**	**

^{*}The State does not publish this data

^{**}State did not test in this year for off grades (2 and 4)

Lulu Ross Elementary Table 2f Nationally Normed Measure Math Problem Solving

Grade 3 Stanford Achievement Test - SAT-9

Edition/Publication Year: 1996 Publisher: Harcourt Educational Measurement

Systems

Scores are reported as: NCE's X	Scaled S	cores	Percentiles		
	2002-	2001-	2000-	1999-	1998-
	2003	2002	2001	2000	1999
Testing Month	March	March	March	April	April
Reading Comprehension- Ross Elementary					
Mean NCE Score	69.9	66.1	66.2	55.7	57.3
Number of students tested	133	166	139	131	150
Percent of students tested	100.0%	99.4%	99.3%	99.2%	100.0%
Number of students excluded	0	1	1	1	0
Percent of students excluded	0.0%	0.6%	0.7%	0.8%	0.0%
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. African American	58.8	57.8	54.7	49.1	39.4
2. Caucasian	72.7	68.4	69.5	59.4	62.4
State Scores					
State Mean NCE Score	63.6	63	61.1	59.7	55

Lulu Ross Elementary Table 2g Nationally Normed Measure Math Problem Solving

Grade 4 Stanford Achievement Test - SAT-9

Edition/Publication Year: 1996 Publisher: Harcourt Educational Measurement

Systems

Scores are reported as: NCE's X	Scaled S	Scores	Percentiles		
•	2002-	2001-	2000-	1999-	1998-
	2003	2002	2001	2000	1999
Testing Month	March	March	March	April	April
Reading Comprehension- Ross Elementary					
Mean NCE Score	62.9	60.7	**	**	**
Number of students tested	159	156	**	**	**
Percent of students tested	98.1%	100.0%	**	**	**
Number of students excluded	3.0	0.0	**	**	**
Percent of students excluded	1.9%	0.0%	**	**	**
SUBGROUP SCORES			**	**	**
1. African American	53.7	49.0	**	**	**
2. Caucasian	63.6	64.5	**	**	**
State Scores					
State Mean NCE Score	NA*	NA*	**	**	**

^{*}The State does not publish this data

^{**}State did not test in this year for off grades (2 and4)

Lulu Ross Elementary Table 2h Nationally Normed Measure Math Problem Solving

Grade 5 Stanford Achievement Test - SAT-9

Edition/Publication Year: 1996 Publisher: Harcourt Educational Measurement

Systems

Scores are reported as: NCE's X	Scaled S	cores	Percentiles	3	
	2002-	2001-	2000-	1999-	1998-
	2003	2002	2001	2000	1999
Testing Month		March	March	April	April
Reading Comprehension- Ross Elementary					
Mean NCE Score	64.3	*	*	*	*
Number of students tested	149	*	*	*	*
Percent of students tested	100.0%	*	*	*	*
Number of students excluded	0.0	*	*	*	*
Percent of students excluded	0.0%	*	*	*	*
SUBGROUP SCORES		*	*	*	*
1. African American	51.9	*	*	*	*
2. Caucasian	67.0	*	*	*	*
State Scores					
State Mean NCE Score	55.1	*	*	*	*

^{*}Ross students located at other schools.